

Globalizing Hope: The Resonance of Zapatismo and the Political Imagination(s) of Transnational Activism

GHC 04/6

December 2004

WORKING PAPER SERIES

**Alex Khasnabish
McMaster University**



**Institute on Globalization
and the HUMAN CONDITION**

KTH 234, 1280 Main St W, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON L8S 4M4
(905) 525-9140 Ext. 27556 <http://www.humanities.mcmaster.ca/~global/>

**GLOBALIZATION AND AUTONOMY
MONDIALISATION ET AUTONOMIE**



Preface

Alex Khasnabish, a doctoral student in the Department of Anthropology at McMaster University, received a Graduate Research Scholarship from the Institute on Globalization and the Human Condition in the 2003-2004 academic year. He used this award to continue his doctoral research on the Zapatista rebellion and movement in Chiapas, Mexico, which began on January 1, 1994, the same date as the North American Free Trade Agreement came into effect. The Zapatismo phenomenon is a complex one and offers many avenues for study and debate. In this Working Paper, Mr. Khasnabish examines the impact of the Zapatistas on political and social movements in North America. He is interested in whether the Zapatistas changed these movements in any important ways.

He argues that they did have a major impact, but it is not one that is immediately self-evident. The Zapatistas, despite being a ragtag group of poverty-stricken indigenous persons drawn from the state of Chiapas, were able to inspire hope among many other, very different and much more well-resourced social and political movements. They had this impact through their capacity to spur the political imagination of activists in new ways. Khasnabish argues that political imagination is crucial for social and political movements contesting the hegemonic dominance of neo-liberal thinking and neo-liberal practices in wealthier countries. To develop this argument, he begins by carrying out a careful review of several key philosophers and social critics who have commented on the role of the imagination. In this review, he finds that the thinking does not really help us to understand well the ways in which political imaginations drew strength from the Zapatistas. He turns then to theorists like Ernst Bloch, Cornelius Castoriadis and Guy Debord for inspiration in understanding better the role of the imagination. With this better understanding, he reflects ably on the comments he received from activists in North America outside Mexico on the Zapatistas and their impact on their own work in contesting global capitalism.

William D. Coleman
Editor, Working Paper Series

Globalizing Hope: The Resonance of Zapatismo and the Political Imagination(s) of Transnational Activism

Alex Khasnabish, McMaster University

“The new distribution of the world excludes ‘minorities’. The indigenous, youth, women, homosexuals, lesbians, people of color, immigrants, workers, peasants; the majority who make up the world basements are presented, for power, as disposable. The new distribution of the world excludes the majorities.

The modern army of financial capital and corrupt governments advance conquering in the only way it is capable of: destroying. The new distribution of the world destroys humanity.

The new distribution of the world only has one place for money and its servants. Men, women and machines become equal in servitude and in being disposable. The lie governs and it multiplies itself in means and methods.

A new lie is sold to us as history. The lie about the defeat of hope, the lie about the defeat of dignity, the lie about the defeat of humanity. The mirror of power offers us an equilibrium in the balance scale: the lie about the victory of cynicism, the lie about the victory of servitude, the lie about the victory of neoliberalism.

Instead of humanity, it offers us stock market value indexes, instead of dignity it offers us globalization of misery, instead of hope it offers us an emptiness, instead of life it offers us the international of terror.

Against the international of terror representing neoliberalism, we must raise the international of hope. Hope, above borders, languages, colors, cultures, sexes, strategies, and thoughts, of all those who prefer humanity alive.

The international of hope. Not the bureaucracy of hope, not the opposite image and, thus, the same as that which annihilates us. Not the power with a new sign or new clothing. A breath like this, the breath of dignity. A flower yes, the flower of hope. A song yes, the song of life.

Dignity is that nation without nationality, that rainbow that is also a bridge, that murmur of the heart no matter what blood lives it, that rebel irreverence that mocks borders, customs and wars.

Hope is that rejection of conformity and defeat”.

From the First Declaration of La Realidad for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism by Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos

In *The Dialogic Imagination* (1981) Mikhail Bakhtin states that “[e]very word is directed toward an answer and cannot escape the profound influence of the answering word that it anticipates” (Bakhtin 1981: 280). If this is so, then what answer was anticipated by the cry of “Ya basta!”, “Enough!”, which issued from the mouths of faceless indigenous guerrillas of the Zapatista Army of National Liberation on January 1, 1994? What reply did the Zapatistas expect to hear? In the years since the Zapatista Army of National Liberation rose up in arms in the southeastern-most Mexican state of Chiapas on the very day that the North American Free Trade Agreement came into effect, much has been written about the Zapatistas’ origins, agenda, struc-

ture, history, tactics, and ultimate goals as well as those of their most public mask, Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos (Arquilla et al. 1998; Collier and Quaratiello 1999; Harvey 1998; Hernandez Navarro 2002; Kingsnorth 2003; Klein 2002; Leyva Solano 1998; Monsivais 2002; Nash 2001; Ross 2000; Rus et al. 2003; Stephen 2002; Weinberg 2000; Womack Jr. 1999). Yet in all of this, the question of why their cry of “Ya basta!” and their ensuing struggle for “justice, democracy, and liberty” has resonated so strongly with people not only beyond the borders of Chiapas but beyond those of Mexico as well remains largely unconsidered. In this paper, I consider the significance of the Zapatista struggle within the broader context of North American political activism since 1994. The types of activism I refer to here span a range from individuals and organizations focusing upon human rights issues to those deeply involved in what has become known as the global anti-capitalist movement. All these individuals and organizations are outside of “mainstream” channels of political participation. I use the term “significance” here purposefully – only peripherally will issues of movement infrastructure and networks enter into this analysis. Instead, I focus upon the processes of transmission, translation, and resonance in relation to how Zapatismo has become meaningful for activists located within their own particular contexts and engaged in the dynamics of their own particular struggles. I also investigate what the consequence of this emergent “political imagination” is.

In his play *Accidental Death of an Anarchist* (2003), Dario Fo paints a farcical but compelling picture of political scandal not as a subversive spectacle, but as a spectacle which actually serves to reinforce existing systems of power and privilege. In his play, Fo illustrates how the spectacle of scandal actually serves as a form of collective catharsis because we are able to condemn the particularities of a given political scandal and yet reaffirm our faith in the larger system out of which it has emerged. If scandal is reaffirming of existing structures of power, what about the idea of counter-spectacles, spectacles designed intentionally to disrupt the “business as usual” of modern, liberal-democratic structures of power? Can these counter-spectacles bring about moments of rupture within a given socio-political context or do they also serve to somehow reinforce it? I ask this question because the Zapatistas’ flair for the dramatic has been one of their most frequently commented-upon traits in the years since their 1994 uprising (Klein 2002; Ross 2000; Stavans 2002; Weinberg 2000; Womack Jr. 1999). In fact, it has been argued that many of the Zapatistas’ initiatives over the past ten years from the Intercontinental Encuentro in Chiapas in 1996 to the March of Indigenous Dignity in 2001 to the uprising of January 1 itself have all been spectacles designed to rally popular support nationally and internationally. They are seen as a means to achieve the goals set out by Marcos and other Zapatista commanders (De La Colina 2002; Meyer 2002; Oppenheimer 2002). In my analysis, this argument not only misses the point but it also reduces the Zapatista struggle to that of yet another “special interest group” applying pressure to elites in order to achieve its own ends. I argue instead that the Zapatista movement has exerted an imaginative and inspirational force far beyond its material capacity and its “concrete” victories over the past 10 years. It is a force rooted in and animated by a distinctive political imagination which has resonated far beyond the indigenous communities of the Lacandon Jungle from which Zapatismo initially emerged. I use the term “political imagination” here in a double sense: firstly, as a reference to imagination as an integral part of radical political practice; and secondly, as a term referring to both the impetus and processes involved in envisioning and articulating political projects which have emerged, directly and indirectly, due to the influence of Zapatismo. Thus political imagination is both an act and a constellation of political projects.

Imaginations

Before proceeding to a more direct analysis of Zapatismo and its resonance for US and Canadian activists, I first turn to a consideration of “imagination” as it relates to social and political action through an engagement with the works of Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar (2002), Charles Taylor (2002), Benjamin Lee and Edward

LiPuma (2002), Cornelius Castoriadis (1991), and Ernst Bloch (1986). By way of providing a foundation for the analysis of the resonance of Zapatismo, the questions which I explore in this section are as follows: what is the “imagination”, where does it emerge from in a given social context and what are its potentials? Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar, Charles Taylor, and Benjamin Lee and Edward LiPuma, engage these questions within socio-political and economic contexts shaped by “modernity” and “globalization” and thus provide a useful starting point with which to frame my analysis of the resonance of Zapatismo for US and Canadian activists.

For Gaonkar and Taylor, imagination is what makes social existence possible. In the words of Taylor, the “social imaginary... is what enables, through making sense of, the practices of a society” and it is often conveyed not in theoretical terms but rather through “images, stories, and legends” (Gaonkar & Taylor 2002: 91-106). For Gaonkar, social imaginaries are “first-person subjectivities that build upon implicit understandings that underlie and make possible common practices” (Gaonkar & Taylor 2002: 4). These subjectivities are “embedded in the habitus of a population or are carried in modes of address, stories, symbols, and the like.” They are “imaginary in a double sense” existing as they do by virtue of representations or implicit understandings as well as serving as the conceptual means by which people make sense of their own identities and their place in the world (Gaonkar & Taylor 2000: 4). These conceptualizations of the social imagination, while somewhat generalized and vague and almost totally devoid of both dynamic energy and individual agency, nevertheless assert the key point that social imaginations are what enable action and serve both to animate social practice and, more significantly, to make sense out of it.

In line with Gaonkar’s and Taylor’s notion of imagination’s being embedded and its relation to practices of social and material production, Benjamin Lee and Edward LiPuma contend that modern “cultures of circulation are created and animated by the cultural forms that circulate through them, including – critically – the abstract nature of the forms that underwrite and propel the process of circulation itself” (Lee & LiPuma 2002: 192). Thus, the contemporary Euro-American social imaginary of “modernity”, Lee and LiPuma contend, is fundamentally constituted by the public sphere, the modern citizen-state, and the market. Not only do we collectively imagine this to be so but also processes of circulation and the “cultural forms” which move through them give form and significance to these spaces (Lee & LiPuma 2002: 194). Here circulation becomes the generative force itself, both materially and imaginatively. This reflection too is significant precisely because processes of circulation – both material (the movement of activists; the production, marketing, and sale of Zapatista-made goods; the production and distribution of text, music, and film about or inspired by Zapatismo) and virtual (electronic communication including organizing, protest action, and sharing information among activists but also the dissemination of the Zapatista struggle through words and images) – are deeply implicated in facilitating the resonance of Zapatismo beyond the borders of Chiapas and even Mexico. Yet while Lee and LiPuma provide extensive reflections upon the nature of globalized capitalism and the privileged capacity of economics to grasp the “dynamics of circulation that are driving globalization,” they provide considerably less insight into the social imagination as anything but a product of regimes of circulation. In their analysis, “cultures of circulation” are driven almost purely by the processes of circulation itself and all other phenomena are merely caught up within it (Lee & LiPuma 2002: 191). Social imagination and its potentials are thus reduced to, at most, the impetus propelling circulation while the nature of the “cultural forms” and their “abstractions” – whatever they may be - characterize the substance of culture itself. We are left with a vision of landscapes, both imagined and real, absent of human agency and even of human actors.

The reflections of Gaonkar, Taylor, Lee and LiPuma in relation to the notion of “imagination” are, in many ways, reminiscent of the writing of Cornelius Castoriadis, particularly in his work “Power, Politics, Autonomy”. In this work, Castoriadis asserts that in order for the individual to consolidate their own autonomy “the forma-

tion of a reflective and deliberative instance” rooted in an “explicit and unlimited interrogation” of “social imaginary significations and their possible grounding” must be generated (Castoriadis 1991: 163). This critical and questioning instance “frees the radical imagination of the singular human being as source of creation and alteration and allows this being to attain an effective freedom”. The responsibility and power for opening this foundational instance of unlimited interrogation rests solely upon the “radical imaginary of the anonymous collectivity”, a phenomenon which is itself constrained by the limitations inherent in what Castoriadis refers to as the “nature of the socio-historical” (Castoriadis 1991: 165-171). Thus, for Gaonkar, Taylor, Lee and LiPuma, and Castoriadis, the imagination and all that is dependent upon it remains inaccessible to human action and agency. Our capacity to imagine and the socio-political dynamics and forces which it can generate therefore remain fundamentally constrained, pre-determined, and ultimately incomprehensible. On the contrary, what I hope my analysis will demonstrate is that while “openings” certainly need to be generated, the limitations of political imagination are far less significant than these authors appear to contend.

If the reflections on the imagination offered by Gaonkar, Taylor, Lee and LiPuma, and Castoriadis are somewhat inadequate, as I believe they are, then are there other conceptualizations of the imagination which are more compelling and perhaps more relevant to comprehending its capacity to generate radical socio-political change? The Utopian Marxism of Ernst Bloch, I believe, serves as an important starting point for this search. While remaining very much materially-grounded, Bloch nevertheless establishes in the three volumes of *The Principle of Hope* the notion that radical social transformation ultimately and fundamentally rests upon the human capacity to imagine such radical change and to be inspired by hope to strive for it without necessarily operating with a “social blueprint” in mind. This notion resonates strongly with the Zapatistas’ own struggles over the past 10 years of open rebellion. Hope, in the sense that Bloch invokes it, is not mere emotion but “more essentially...a directing act of the cognitive kind” manifested as a “forward dream” of a distinctly utopian character (Bloch 1986: 12). Essential to Bloch’s inquiry into the capacity for hope and the pursuit of a directing and anticipatory cognition is the concept he describes as the “Not-Yet”, that which has not yet come to pass and as such is still open to revolutionary formation. For Bloch, the revolutionary and utopian potential of hope lies in the fact that the essential characteristic of the “being” of the world rests not upon what it is or what it has been but rather upon what it might become. Certainly Zapatismo as it has developed over the past 10 years has continually affirmed the necessity of people expressing and fulfilling their own needs while building a “world which holds many worlds”. This space necessarily has no predetermined nature or ideological contours other than being built in the spirit of “democracy, liberty, and justice”. It is this kind of imagination, a cognitive action characterized by hopeful uncertainty, that returns the capacity to stimulate radical social and political change to those who are bold enough to imagine what a different world might look like.

Where does the hope reside upon which Bloch focuses so greatly and, more significantly, from where do hopeful visions of a new social order emerge? Bloch situates the “space of receptivity of the New and production of the New” in the realm of the unconscious or, more appropriately, in the realm of the “Not-Yet-Conscious” (Bloch 1986: 116). Bloch posits that many actually existing works, whether they be works of art, literature, architecture, or political ideals, contain a latent utopian element that extends beyond their connection to the existing relations of domination and ruling ideologies which they directly emerged from (Bloch 1986: 164). Bloch further develops his position by asserting the fundamentally unclosed nature of the world itself. This circumstance is demonstrated by the fact that nothing “could be altered in accordance with wishes if the world were closed, full of fixed, even perfected facts” (Bloch 1986: 196). Despite this point, Bloch nevertheless continues to assert the notion that there is a trajectory of being, not merely that the nature of being remains fundamentally unclosed. Significantly, while the Not-Yet-Conscious is the space of incubation for the “Not-

Yet-Become” in the world, this “Novum” cannot manifest itself or even be articulated by the subject in whom it resides without the presence of the appropriate socio-historical conditions (Bloch 1986: 124-130). This point is of critical importance because it implies that the conditions which allow for not only the success of a radical refashioning of the “being” of the world, but also the very expression of it are dependent upon circumstances outside of any actor’s control. This formulation seems not so different from that proposed by Castoriadis and echoed by Lee and LiPuma, Gaonkar, and Taylor.

What is interesting about this formulation is that measured by such standards and in light of the dominant socio-historical conditions at the time, the Zapatista Uprising itself should not have occurred, and even having occurred it should not have been able to generate the forceful resonance it did. As Adolfo Gilly (2002) has remarked, immediately preceding the Zapatista Uprising the leadership of the EZLN, including Marcos, appeared to be unconvinced about initiating an armed uprising due to the prevailing political climate. It was the communities that voted for war. Why? Because as Gilly explains, “[t]he channels through which” people – in this case the leadership of the EZLN on one side and the communities on the other - “get their perceptions of the surrounding society are not the same; nor are the filters and the codes according to which they are interpreted” (Gilly 2002: 339). For the Zapatistas this difference meant that while some Zapatista leaders saw the collapse of the Soviet Union as a negative factor, others did not perceive this upheaval in the same way. Thus they “measure by other means – against the arc of their own lives – the maturation of the conditions for rebellion” (Gilly 2002: 340). I would argue the same is true for the political imagination and is a key to comprehending the transnational resonance of Zapatismo. The reasons for, and consequences of, this phenomenon must be sought not only in the contemporary socio-historical dimensions or within the imagination of some anonymous collective but also “by other means”. Not the least of these is “against the arc” of peoples’ own lives and that of their attendant hopes and perceptions of the worlds they inhabit.

Through this engagement of the work of theorists who have taken up the challenge of situating the imagination in relation to projects of social and political formation, I have attempted to provide a basis for understanding the resonance of the Zapatista political imagination amongst US and Canadian activists. Imagination, both as an essential element of struggle and as a fundamental tool for being able to relate to realities different from one’s own, has and continues to be central to the Zapatista movement and its resonance transnationally. Many Zapatista-inspired activists in Canada and the US have never travelled to Chiapas or visited a Zapatista community. Their information about and experience of the movement is thus profoundly mediated not only by technology and those who tell stories about the region, its people, and their struggles, but also by their own capacity to imagine all this in a way that is meaningful to them personally. Imagination also plays an integral role in the lives of those activists who have intimate knowledge of the Zapatista struggle on the ground in Chiapas. They too must not only be able to “understand” the Zapatista struggle and how it relates to others occurring around the world, but also to envision concrete strategies, tactics, and initiatives to engage in to “materialize” their commitments.

Conceptualizing imagination in relation to social and political phenomena is no easy task as the work of the theorists who I engaged amply demonstrates. Despite this difficulty it is possible to appreciate the theoretical threads that bind these diverse works together as well as the significant differences which exist amongst them. Although there certainly exists a degree of commonality with respect to the notion that “social imaginary... is what enables, through making sense of, the practices of a society”, in Taylor’s words, and it is conveyed via myriad forms, its libratory potential, its dependency upon existing social, political, and economic structures, and its relationship to individual human agency are widely contested. Though the differences amongst the theorists with whom I have engaged may resemble a contest between tendencies focusing on structure or

agency, the repercussions of this contest are nevertheless profound. If imagination in its social and political dimensions is ultimately profoundly constrained, either by the nature of circulation, the radical imaginary of the anonymous collectivity, or socio-historical conditions, then so too is our capacity for radical action and innovation. If, in contrast, imagination is dependent on these factors and more but nevertheless remains capable of conceptualizing in the direction of the “Not-Yet”, to borrow Bloch’s term, then our capacities, their potentials, and the range of possible outcomes remain fundamentally unclosed. It is with this tension in mind that I now turn to my analysis of Zapatismo, its resonance, and the dimensions of the political imagination.

Zapatismo: Transmission and Reception

“Brothers and sisters, there is dissent over the projects of globalization all over the world. Those above, who globalise conformism, cynicism, stupidity, war, destruction and death. And those below who globalize rebellion, hope, creativity, intelligence, imagination, life, memory and the construction of a world that we can all fit in, a world with democracy, liberty and justice”.

From “*Globalize Hope*” by Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos

How does a guerrilla army comprised of a few thousand poorly-armed indigenous insurgents, a pipe-smoking academically-trained mestizo spokesperson, and thousands of community-based supporters come to represent a global struggle for human dignity and against neoliberal capitalism? How, why, and with what consequences has the struggle of the Zapatistas for “justice, liberty, and democracy” come to inspire communities of activists transnationally? How, why, and with what consequences has the date of the Zapatista uprising, January 1, 1994, become year zero in the history of the global anti-capitalist movement? To return to the question I asked at the start of this paper, if every utterance is directed toward and shaped by the response it anticipates, then what response did the Zapatista cry of “Ya basta!”, “Enough!”, anticipate? Could it have possibly anticipated the transnational resonance of Zapatismo in the years since January 1, 1994? Perhaps this question has no answer, but the dimensions of the resonance itself certainly bear a closer look. Before proceeding with this analysis, I wish to first admit to the preliminary and partial nature of some of the reflections I provide here. I am currently engaged in completing this research and as such much of the analysis also remains unfinished. Nevertheless, I feel my work thus far has yielded some important insights to which I now wish to turn.

In Canada and the United States, the resonance of Zapatismo has given rise not only to a diversity of organizations expressing direct solidarity with the Zapatistas but also to movements, organizations, and forms of political activism which overflow the bounds of solidarity and which have yielded new and unanticipated results. It should be noted that one of the most obvious and widespread symptoms of the resonance of Zapatismo transnationally is the adoption of its rhetoric. This impact is most frequently conveyed via the writings of Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos and disseminated globally not only in printed form but also via the Internet, CD-ROMs, DVDs, and audio and video tapes. The resonance of Zapatismo is one born of poetry; it is a resonance which inspires rather than leads; it creates a resonance which speaks the audacious language of creativity, imagination, laughter, and hope rather than that of tactics, dogma, and structure. It is of vital importance to recognize that the resonance of Zapatismo is by no means identical to active solidarity with the concrete struggles of Zapatista communities in Chiapas. Rather, this resonance alludes to the presence of Zapatismo as a sign in a globalized field of meaning. This is not to say that Zapatismo is an “empty” or “co-opted” political project. On the contrary, it is a project which overflows with meaning from the perspective of many activists involved in the search for new political spaces and practices both in Canada and in the United States.

During the course of my research I have engaged activists from a variety of organizations and projects. These include: Big Noise Tactical; Building Bridges; Food for Chiapas; Global Exchange; “hacktivists” from the University of Toronto; Mexico Solidarity Network; Peoples’ Global Action; the Smartmeme Project; activists involved in planning the Third Intercontinental Encuentro for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism; and a variety of activists involved in political projects ranging from Latin American solidarity to involvement in the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty to community capacity-building projects. Organizations such as Building Bridges based in Vancouver, British Columbia and Global Exchange, based in San Francisco, California are perhaps two organizations which have responded to Zapatismo in more “traditional” way. Building Bridges has worked through the training and accreditation of human rights observers who then travel to Chiapas to live in Zapatista communities. Global Exchange has sought to build “people to people ties” through facilitating reality tours to places like Chiapas. In the same vein, Zapatismo inspired the work of three “hacktivists” from the University of Toronto to travel to Guatemala and Chiapas in the summer of 2003 in order to provide their technical expertise to organizations working to support indigenous struggles. This journey was documented in the film *Hacktivista*. Similarly, but perhaps in a more explicitly political manner, the Mexico Solidarity Network in the United States groups over 90 organizations together and emerged initially in the aftermath of the Acteal massacre in 1998 in order to support the Zapatistas. MSN has since expanded its focus considerably to include an emphasis on trade agreements and US militarism. In Canada, Food for Chiapas emerged in Toronto in April 1994 in order to respond to the needs of the Zapatista communities in Chiapas.

If these organizations could be said to represent a more “traditional” political response to Zapatismo, there are most certainly individuals and organizations in Canada and the US who have felt the impact of Zapatismo and translated its meanings in other ways. Radical filmmakers such as Big Noise Tactical, who produced such films as *This is What Democracy Looks Like*, *Zapatista*, and, most recently, *The Fourth World War* locate a large part of the inspiration for their work in the resonance of Zapatismo. Initiatives such as the Third Intercontinental Encuentro for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism, inspired by and modeled on the original Zapatista Intergalactic Encuentro held in the jungles of Chiapas in 1996, was to have been held in the summer of 2003 in Ontario. It sought to bring together indigenous peoples, academics, labour activists, people involved in Latin American solidarity movements, and others in an effort to see it realized. While the Encuentro did not materialize ultimately, the vision which inspired it nevertheless stands as a testament to the resonance of Zapatismo. Also related to the Zapatista Encuentros is the transnational network of anti-capitalist coordination and communication known as Peoples’ Global Action. It has been at the heart of the majority of anti-capitalist spectacles and mass demonstrations since its formation in 1998 and has emerged as a direct response to the Zapatistas’ call for a transnational network of communication “for humanity and against neoliberalism”. PGA has been a tremendously effective coordinating and communication tool for a multiplicity of distinct struggles globally without having become an “organization” itself. The Smartmeme Strategy and Training Project is aimed at grassroots movement building and the injection of new ideas into culture, to intervene in capitalism “at the point of assumption”. Although the project itself is not directly related to Zapatismo, its lessons and examples have resonated strongly with its founding members.

The connections of each of these organizations to the Zapatista movement vary greatly as do the experiences of the individuals involved with respect to Zapatismo. Certainly, no consideration of the transmission and reception of the Zapatista struggle can avoid acknowledging the fact that pre-existing political solidarity networks focused on Latin America, Indigenous peoples, and human rights played a significant role in the transmission and translation of the struggle (see Arquilla et al. 1998). However, beyond issues of pre-existing infrastructure and an activist community which had some familiarity with the region, what could account for the

significance attributed by US and Canadian supporters to Zapatismo in the aftermath of the uprising in 1994? This question should be considered in relation to the fact that the EZLN is far from the only, let alone the most dangerous, armed insurgent organization in Mexico. In fact, in the years following the Zapatista Uprising, the Popular Revolutionary Army (EPR) staged a series of bold and violent attacks on police and military installations, demonstrating a willingness and proficiency with respect to violent action that the Zapatistas never approached (see Ross 2000). Unlike insurrectionary movements of the past such as the Sanadanistas and the Cuban revolutionaries under Fidel Castro and Che Guevara, the Zapatistas did not attempt to capture the state and its infrastructure for their project nor have they managed to force significant concessions from the Mexican government.

In light of this fact, how can the presence and success of a transnationalized Zapatismo be understood? Rebecca Solnit, author and US-based activist, offers a telling perspective on Zapatismo and its global significance in her work *Hope in the Dark: Untold Histories, Wild Possibilities* (2004) that bears quoting at length:

[i]n dazzling proclamations and manifestos, the Zapatistas announced the rise of the fourth world and their radical rejection of neoliberalism. They were never much of a military force, but their intellectual and imaginative power has been staggering... [The Zapatistas] came not just to enact a specific revolution but to bring a revolution, so to speak, in the nature of revolutions. They critiqued the dynamics of power, previous revolutions, capitalism, colonialism, militarism, sexism, racism, and occasionally Marxism, recognizing the interplay of many forces and agendas in any act, any movement. They were nothing so simple as socialists, and they did not posit the old vision of state socialism as a solution to the problems of neoliberalism. They affirmed women's full and equal rights, refusing to be the revolution that sacrifices or postpones one kind of justice for another. They did not attempt to export their revolution but invited others to find their own local version of it, and from their forests and villages they entered into conversation with the world through *encuentros*, or encounters – conferences of a sort – communiqués, emissaries, and correspondence. For the rest of us, the Zapatistas came as a surprise and as a demonstration that overnight, the most marginal, overlooked place can become the center of the world.

They were not just demanding change, but embodying it; and in this, they were and are already victorious... They understood the interplay between physical actions, those carried out with guns, and symbolic actions, those carried out with rods, with images, with art, with communications, and they won through the latter means what they never could have won through their small capacity for violence (Solnit 2004: 34-35).

I quote Solnit's passage here at length not as a perfect description of the essence of Zapatismo but rather to offer it as a particularly eloquent statement of Zapatismo's significance in the eyes of many - but by no means all - US and Canadian activists. The dimensions of the movement Solnit talks about are not wrong. Rather they do speak to issues which resonate perhaps more strongly within the contexts of US and Canadian-based activists than within the reality which the Zapatistas themselves inhabit. Solnit's assessment emphasises notions of hope, creativity, human dignity, communication, democracy, and what could be termed an intellectual and political cosmopolitanism. These elements I would argue are most certainly present in Zapatismo, all the more so with respect to the communiqués and communicative actions directed toward supporters transnationally. They also speak to needs (a powerful rejection of neoliberalism; affirmation of human dignity; peace; au-

tonomy and interconnectedness; the desire to speak and be heard as well as to listen) and means (communicative and symbolic rather than violent action) familiar to people struggling within “First World” or “post-industrial” societies like Canada and the United States. Less apparent, but by no means always absent from this perspective on Zapatismo are the complexities of the Zapatista struggle on the ground in Chiapas, the mundane work of building relations of “good government” amongst the communities and municipalities in rebellion, and the unavoidable contradictions which occupy the sphere of human action.

Zapatismo: Resonance

“Neoliberalism attempts to subjugate millions of beings, and seeks to rid itself of all those who have no place in its new ordering of the world. But these ‘disposable’ people are in revolt: women, children, old people, young people, indigenous peoples, ecological militants, homosexuals, lesbians, HIV activists, workers, and all those who upset the ordered progress of the new world system and who organize and are in struggle. Resistance is being woven by those who are excluded from ‘modernity’”.

From “The Fourth World War Has Begun” by Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos

How can the resonance of Zapatismo be understood? More precisely, how can the transnationalization of Zapatismo be considered with respect to globalizing processes and the contours of “late” or “post-industrial” capitalism? In his work *Modernity at Large*, Arjun Appadurai takes up issues related to these questions as he explores the role of mass media and migration “on the work of the imagination as a constitutive feature of modern subjectivity” (Appadurai 1996: 4). Appadurai argues that imagination has acquired a “newly significant role” having broken away from an exclusive connection with art, myth, and ritual to become “part of the quotidian mental work of ordinary people in many societies” (Appadurai 1996: 6). This shift in the role of imagination has resulted in a “plurality of imagined worlds” and, rather than resulting in mass escapes into fantasy, has become “the fuel” and the “staging ground” for action (Appadurai 1996: 7). Such reflections certainly evoke elements of contemporary anti-capitalist organizing such as the Global Action Days organized by networks like Peoples’ Global Action and the massive street parties held under the banner of Reclaim the Streets, both of which have drawn heavily on imagination and creativity in their actions. Although Appadurai raises some powerful points about the capacity for imagination to serve as the “staging ground” for action, his laudatory analysis seems to miss the point. If the ascendancy of the collective imagination has been driven by the fact that “people, machinery, money, images, and ideas now follow increasingly nonisomorphic paths” (Appadurai 1996: 37), these deterritorialized flows which feed the imagination are by no means “neutral”. While Appadurai sees these deterritorialized flows as promoting fertile ground for national and transnational “spectacles” which in turn provide “more an arena for conscious choice, justification, and representation” (Appadurai 1996: 44), he does not engage the notion that these flows exist within contexts shaped by the dimensions and demands of global neoliberal capitalism. Accordingly, they cannot help but be shaped by it.

Guy Debord eloquently engages the relationship between late capitalism, spectacle, and imagination in his work *Society of the Spectacle* (1983) and in so doing addresses some of the problematic elements which emerge from Appadurai’s work. In this work, Debord argues that life in modern capitalist societies is presented as “an immense accumulation of spectacles”, spectacles which are not simply a collection of images but rather images which serve to mediate relations amongst people. These relations are fundamentally characterized not by interconnectedness or collectivity but by separation (Debord 1983: paragraphs 1-4). Thus the deterritorialized flows and the spectacles and imaginaries which they give rise to, which Appadurai views as so productive and even empowering, in Debord’s view are the “fetishistic, purely objective appearance of spectacular relations”. They serve to transmit and enforce the content and structure of socially dominant life and to

obscure “actual” relations amongst people (Debord 1983: paragraphs 6-24). These spectacles are, of course, shaped by those who control the machinery with which the spectacle may be generated. This machinery drives mass media but is also responsible for the production of spaces and places (both real and virtual) in which people live their lives. Above all else, the spectacles of late capitalism are designed to generate desire in people for the “abundant commodity” and to represent and reproduce social relations of separation and alienation, control and compartmentalization integral to the functioning of the capitalist system itself. Debord’s conceptualization of the spectacle in late capitalism may be too narrow a view to allow for a consideration of the spaces for action and imagination that Appadurai focuses upon. Nevertheless, he raises important dimensions of the connection between a society increasingly mediated by “spectacle” and the machines (both real and figurative) which produce them and the interests which drive them.

Both Appadurai and Debord raise important points about imagination and spectacle as they relate to the resonance of Zapatismo transnationally. Information about the Zapatista struggle has been transmitted via information technologies such as the Internet and the production of videos and DVDs as well as through the movement of activists across borders (primarily from North to South) in roles ranging from casual “Zapatouristas” to human rights observers to peace campers to solidarity delegations. Yet it should be clear that such “flows” of people, images, and information are by no means neutral and rely upon the characteristics, both social and technological, often attributed to so-called “post-industrial” societies such as Canada and the United States. In fact, while much has been made of the Zapatistas’ presence on the Internet and the media-savvy skills of their spokesperson Subcomandante Marcos, many Zapatista communities lack basic utilities such as electricity and running water, let alone access to the Internet or international travel. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri state in *Empire* (2000), today “the imaginary is guided and channeled within the communicative machine”, a process resulting not simply in the imaginary and the symbolic being put at the service of power but also rather “actually integrating them into its very functioning” (Hardt & Negri 2000: 33). The very channels utilized to deploy and engage these Zapatista-inspired political landscapes are simultaneously deeply linked to other processes which form a significant portion of the Zapatistas’ rationale for rising up in rebellion in the first place.

I do not hold, however, a reductive or deterministic view of this discrepancy in wealth and access. Much as the impact of Zapatismo has all too often been reduced to Marcos’ communicative abilities, valid criticisms of aspects of the international response to Zapatismo have been turned into sweeping denunciations of the international solidarity movement. In these analyses, North American and European supporters of the Zapatista movement have been criticized for a number of unfortunate and even damaging tendencies including: a facile romanticism of Indigenous peoples and armed insurgency; an overreliance on “virtual” as opposed to “real” images of the struggle in Chiapas; a desire to look for revolution “somewhere else” rather than facing issues of concern “at home”; and an obsession on the part of foreign supporters of the Zapatista movement with the “trope” of Chiapas (see Hellman 2000; Meyer 2002). Once again, although such assertions may be accurate with respect to some elements of the international solidarity movement, it is an incomplete analysis. Just as pointing to Marcos’ writing or the Internet does not explain why Zapatismo has resonated beyond Chiapas neither does focusing on criticisms of elements of a tremendously diverse network of supporters offer a complete or convincing picture of why people paid attention to the uprising initially. Nor does it account for the deep impact Zapatismo has had upon the emergent global social justice and anti-capitalist movement.

In *Empire*, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri offer a provocative analytical perspective with respect to the Zapatista Uprising that provides a useful opportunity to explicitly address issues of circulation and communication with respect to political struggles. In their analysis, Hardt and Negri contend that the Zapatista rebellion was not able to stimulate other revolutionary struggles nor was it able to form a link in a chain of struggles

because “the desires and needs [it] expressed could not be translated into different contexts” Thus people in other parts of the world could not recognize it as their own struggle as well (Hardt & Negri 2000: 54). Contemporary struggles such as that of the Zapatistas, Hardt and Negri maintain, have become “incommunicable and thus blocked from travelling horizontally in the form of a cycle”, for two primary reasons, First, the “nature of the common enemy is obscured”, and second, “no common language exists to translate the particular language of each struggle into a ‘cosmopolitan’ language” (Hardt & Negri 2000: 57). This notion of a cycle of struggle thus extends beyond a politics based in solidarity to metaphorically resemble “a virus that modulates its form to find in each context an adequate host” (Hardt & Negri 2000: 51), and this is precisely what Hardt and Negri contend that contemporary political struggles have been unable to achieve. Although it is not clear that all US and Canadian activists inspired by the Zapatista movement would articulate the Zapatista struggle as their own struggle, it is also difficult not to take issue with Hardt and Negri’s assessment that Zapatismo has remained somehow “incommunicable”. Communication, sustained by more traditional sources such as the Mexican newspaper *La Jornada* as well as e-mail distribution lists such as Chiapas-95 and the web-presence of activist independent media such as Indymedia Chiapas, have played a key role in the transmission of Zapatismo transnationally. Furthermore, and contrary to Hardt and Negri’s assertions, Zapatismo and the language and iconography of the Zapatista movement itself have come to occupy an increasingly important place within the repertoire of global anti-capitalist and social justice activism. Admittedly, this convergence has by no means resulted in the emergence of the “cycle of struggle” which Hardt and Negri discuss. Nor has it even necessarily led to a drastic improvement in the lives of Zapatistas on the ground in Chiapas. None the less, the resonance of Zapatismo within the scope of struggles elsewhere has certainly not been insignificant.

Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari engage many of the issues later picked up by Hardt and Negri in *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (1987), particularly with respect to concepts such as imagination, communication, and the dynamics of political struggle. One of the core concepts deployed by these scholars is the notion of the “rhizome” which is, strictly speaking, a tuber or bulb possessing both shoots and roots (Deleuze & Guattari 1987: 3). Yet the rhizome is also a new way of thinking about realities, particularly when counterposed to the image of the tree or the root. I would argue that the notion of the rhizome not only provides a new way of thinking about realities writ large but also provides a new way of thinking about such phenomena as social movements and the imagination. Composed of “dimensions, or rather directions in motion”, the rhizome has no essential essence. It changes as the relations which comprise it change (Hardt & Negri 2000: 21), and it certainly bears a conceptual resemblance to the viral metaphor employed by Hardt and Negri with respect to a cycle of struggles. The rhizome is not a network, it is not a “structure” of any kind, and as such, its application to such phenomena as the political imagination and social movements is profound and radical in its consequences. What the notion of the rhizome encourages is an explicit consideration of the dynamics of political struggle and the relationships between individuals and groups therein rather than focusing upon “cause-and-effect” relations. Thus the rhizome as a conceptual and analytical tool should not be seen as a way of bypassing or replacing social movement theory so much as a philosophical and theoretical lens through which to explore different dynamics and consequences of contemporary social movement activity.

In fact, as an explanatory tool in and of itself, the rhizome offers us very little. Rather, its true value lies in conceptually re-mapping how social movements and their organizations “fit together”, how they interrelate, and with what consequences. This approach reorients the analytical gaze from questions of resources or “successes” and “failures” to a focus on the complexity of socio-political struggle and its often unanticipated outcomes. I argue that transnationalized Zapatismo is rhizomatic, just as its impact upon US and Canadian activists has rhizomatic qualities. It needs to be understood in this fashion precisely because the experience of

it has been shaped not only by the concrete struggles of Zapatistas in Chiapas or by the eloquence and literary flair of Subcomandante Marcos, but also by the actors who have taken up the challenge of communicating it, the technologies employed to disseminate it, and the desires, needs, and socio-political realities of those who have received it.

The relationship between Zapatismo and the rise of global anti-capitalism is one which has been considered by several authors including Naomi Klein (2002), Paul Kinsnorth (2003), and the editorial collectives of *Midnight Notes* (2001) and *Notes From Nowhere* (2003). Initially, it was the WTO protests in Seattle in 1999 which garnered so much attention with respect to the emergence of this “movement of movements”. Since then, it has been much more widely acknowledged by those involved with the movement itself that January 1, 1994 and the Zapatista uprising is a much more significant moment in this history. Aside from the Zapatista uprising occurring on the first day that the North American Free Trade Agreement came into effect, what can account for the resonance of Zapatismo transnationally? Within Mexico, the works of Xochitl Leyva Solano (1998), Luis Hernandez Navarro (2002), and Carlos Monsivais (2002), provide excellent insight into the national resonance of Zapatismo. Yet transnationally, how can the resonance of Zapatismo be accounted for and, perhaps more significantly, what are its consequences?

In *We Are Everywhere: The Irresistible Rise of Global Anti-Capitalism*, the editorial collective *Notes From Nowhere* constructs a timeline entitled “The Restless Margins: Moments of Resistance and Rebellion: 1994-2003”, and the first entry in this timeline reads as follows: 1994, January 1, “[t]he EZLN... declares war on Mexico bringing its inspirational struggle for life and humanity to the forefront of political imaginations across the planet” (2003: 31). Notions of hope and inspiration are deeply implicated in understanding the impact of Zapatismo in Canada and the United States. Similarly, the resonance of Zapatismo cannot be understood outside of the specific contexts within which those who respond to it live and work. So in 1994, at a time when neoliberal capitalism appeared uncontestedly globally ascendant and the organized left appeared in tatters, the Zapatista uprising burst explosively on to the horizon. Yet the image of armed rebellion was only as successful as the significance attributed to the Zapatistas allowed it to be. After 12 days of fighting, the EZLN had been brutally driven back into the Lacandon Jungle and the Mexican army appeared poised to eliminate them completely. Still, now more than 10 years later the EZLN has survived, Zapatista communities in Chiapas continue to consolidate their autonomy, and the landscape of distinct forms of political activism in the United States and Canada has been indelibly marked by Zapatismo.

So how can this resonance be explained? Firstly, for many of the activists with whom I have spoken both in Canada and in the US, Zapatismo offered precisely what mainstream channels of political participation do not: hope, creativity, imagination, poetry, dialogue, and space. Rather than rallying people with calls for state socialism, the Zapatistas instead took up arms and then took the path of transnational dialogue under such banners as “democracy, liberty, and justice”, a life lived with dignity, commanding by obeying, and walking questioning. They said they masked themselves in order to be seen, armed themselves in order to be heard, and fought not to kill or be killed but to live a life worth living. For activists disillusioned by the defeat of state socialism and numbed by capitalism’s ascendancy, the radically democratic and dignified spirit of Zapatismo was infectious and inspiring. Perhaps even more significantly, even as the Zapatistas sought support and recognition for their own struggle, they simultaneously acknowledged and supported the struggles of others both in Mexico and around the world. As the Zapatista communities in Chiapas continued to struggle against a state of low-intensity war while building autonomous and sustainable communities, Subcomandante Insurgente Marcos continued to engage national and international civil society in a dialogue about building a world in which many worlds would fit. This dialogue resulted in the First Intercontinental Encuentro for Humanity and Against Neoliberalism in the jungles of Chiapas in August 1996. This event drew thousands of participants from around

the world and culminated in a call for the realization of an “International Order of Hope” to build resistance and alternatives to global neoliberal capitalism. The following year, the Second Encuentro would be held in Spain and would serve as the springboard for the emergence of People’s Global Action. Aside from the numerous encounters and spectacles organized by the Zapatistas over the past decade, it has been the ways in which people in their own places have responded to Zapatismo which has been most telling. As North American political channels become ever more professionalized, rationalized, and remote, alienation and disillusionment become defining characteristics of social engagement and political responsibility. As measures of political participation and confidence throughout the US and Canada continue to fall (Crotty 1991; Nevitte 1996), the issue becomes not how to take power but rather how to change the world without taking power for many people already dissatisfied with the corporate liberal democracy of the United States and Canada. In this sense, the Zapatista struggle for autonomy and their commitment to direct democracy resonate far beyond the borders of Chiapas.

Without exception, the activists with whom I have spoken all cite personal and profound experiences with diverse forms of injustice as essential elements in provoking their desire to act politically in the world. Furthermore, the vast majority of these activists also cite their deeply-held belief that in order to address the various sources of social injustice, one needs to operate outside of official channels of political action. Compounding this fact is a sophisticated and thoughtful awareness of several interlacing factors: firstly, the connections between contemporary neoliberal capitalism and existing structures of political and economic power and long-standing historical systems of oppression such as racism, patriarchy, colonialism, and imperialism; secondly, an intellectual and personal awareness of the contemporary dimensions of violence and inequality generated by neoliberal capitalism both at home and globally; thirdly, a rejection of structures of political action which rest upon imposing new structures of domination and violence as well as a rejection of pre-fabricated plans for post-capitalist society; fourthly and finally, a commitment to taking personal responsibility to realize change, often through diverse forms of direct action, and to challenging the legitimacy of existing systems of power and privilege. This is not to say that the political activists who have shared their thoughts and experiences with me have not encountered moments of contradiction nor that they have been unequivocally successful in achieving their aims, far from it. In fact, several of my research partners have commented on what politely might be called the “disjunctures” between the predominantly white global justice movement and resistance communities in the global south and on the creation of an “institutionalized solidarity sector” which actually participates in the further subordination of peoples in the global south.

Often, and sometimes accurately, these activists are accused of having “romanticized” struggles in other places, particularly those in the global south, and often to the detriment of the very people engaged in those struggles. It must be acknowledged that this “romanticism” has certainly come into play with respect to northern activists’ views of the Zapatista movement and has indeed had negative consequences in some instances. None the less, I wish to posit a different interpretation of this romantic sentiment. Is the desire to romanticize not also linked to a desire to reinvigorate a world which has been sapped of its magic, vitality, and spirit? Certainly for the Romantic poets, playwrights, and authors of the late 18th and early 19th centuries, their work was inspired in part as a response to the epistemological violence of the Enlightenment which had resulted in a profound disenchantment of the world – a disenchantment which they sought to contest and a world which they sought to re-imagine through their writings. Undoubtedly, the writings of Zapatista spokesperson Subcomandante Marcos strive to accomplish much the same ends. They are written both in a style and substance which seeks not simply to provoke revolutionary fervour but a re-imagining of the world, of its multiple realities, and of the dreams, hopes, and aspirations of the people who share it. This is also reflected in the carnival atmospheres which accompany so many of the global anti-capitalism movement’s protests. This is not to say that this

romantic impulse is not problematic. Nor is it to say that the intentions with which it is done are unselfish. Rather, it is to say that this impulse needs to be considered in relation to the context in which it occurs and the relations and conditions which it seeks to resist and subvert.

An example of resistance; a thoughtful, democratic struggle for autonomy; a monumental gesture of defiance against the seemingly indomitable force of global neoliberal capitalism; a movement which cherishes life and laughter and which has actively sought to engage others seeking “a world which holds many worlds”; a demonstration of how tactics, strategies, and goals must always be considered within the context which they are set and must always be subordinated to the will and the needs of the people they affect. These are but a few reasons why Zapatismo has resonated so profoundly within activist communities in the US and Canada. The Zapatistas offer an example, they offer hope, and they speak of the things which so many people living within the belly of the neoliberal beast are desperately seeking within their own lives: dignity, autonomy, justice, democracy, and liberty. As many of the people with whom I have spoken have noted, the Zapatistas do not offer a template for struggle here in Canada or in the United States. Rather, they offer a symbol of resistance and the creative search for alternatives which, despite dominant narratives to the contrary, is neither futile nor an anachronism. Of course, this inspiration does not address the deep set inequalities between activists and organizations in the global north and the global south. Many of my own research partners have commented on the fact that one of the most productive things northern activists and intellectuals could do is to help facilitate connections between movements in the global south. They should move to accompany their struggles rather than try to lead them. Furthermore, many, though not all, of my research partners also spoke of their belief that true challenges to neoliberal capitalism, empire, and injustice are, and will continue, to come from the south rather than from the north. In the north, the success of neoliberalism has foreclosed on so many spaces and alienated so many people from one another. Does this not itself reflect a decisive – and not unproblematic – reason for the resonance of Zapatismo transnationally? Zapatistas, distant and dramatic agents of revolutionary change, who embody the desire to rebel felt by those whose own lives – filled with complexity and contradiction – could not support the same radical action. Zapatismo continues to inspire political activism in the US and Canada in a diversity of forms ranging from solidarity campaigns to direct action to information and image-based struggles. In many cases, this inspiration has been “indirect”, that is, it has inhabited people who have not made the pilgrimage, as one of my research partners termed it, to Chiapas and who have never “seen” a Zapatista. Instead, it has come via Marcos’ writings, Zapatista communiqués, and images of struggle transmitted via solidarity networks, often employing technologies which could not exist in Zapatista communities without electricity or running water. This inspiration has also filtered from one group to another, taking on different forms as it does so, and dialogically engaging other socio-political and cultural threads. Peoples’ Global Action is an excellent case in point, as are many of the anti-capitalist collectives active today in Canada and the United States. As one of my research partners from PGA related to me, the Zapatista struggle is both a moment of rupture and a moment in a much larger struggle. In either case, it accelerated the “naming” of capitalism itself as the system which needs to be struggled against and encouraged people to question the nature of the world as we know it.

Aside from the communicative infrastructure and the often “spectacular” nature of the Zapatista struggle, the kernel of transnationalized Zapatismo – a vision of a world in which many worlds fit, an image of connectedness and autonomy, an emphasis on dialogue with respect and peace built with dignity – rather than asserting a pre-fabricated solution to neoliberal capitalism or affirming a singular experience or essence as the “true” one speaks to a wide array of concerned citizens and political activists. In this sense, Zapatismo as a discourse is one which, particularly via the mediation provided by Subcomandante Marcos, is capable of effectively addressing the realities and struggles of northern activists in Canada and the United States. It gains this capability

first by virtue of its legitimacy as an Indigenous-based movement. Second, its “cosmopolitical” sensibilities emphasise a deep commitment to autonomy and self-determination while simultaneously pushing toward greater human interconnectedness, understanding, and co-operation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Appadurai, Arjun (1996) *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Arquilla, John, and Graham Fuller and Melissa Fuller and David Ronfeldt (1998) *The Zapatista Social Netwar in Mexico*. Santa Monica: RAND Arroyo Center.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bloch, Ernst (1986) *The Principle of Hope*. 3 vols. Translated by Neville Plaice, Stephen Plaice and Paul Knight. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Castoriadis, Cornelius (1991) *Power, Politics, Autonomy*. Chap. 7 in *Philosophy, Politics, Autonomy*, edited by David Ames Curtis. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Collier, George A., and Elizabeth Lowery Quaratiello (1999) *Basta! Land & The Zapatista Rebellion in Chiapas*. Oakland: Food First Books.
- Crotty, William (1991) *Political Participation and American Democracy*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- De la Colina, Jose (2002) *As Time Goes By: "Marcos", or the Mask is the Message*. In *The Zapatista Reader*, edited by Tom Hayden. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press. Originally published in *Letras Libras* 1999.
- Debord, Guy (1983) *Society of the Spectacle*. Detroit: Black & Red.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari (1987) *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fo, Dario (2003) *Accidental Death of an Anarchist*. London: Methuen Drama.
- Gaonkar, Dilip Parameshwar (2002) *Toward New Imaginaries: An Introduction*. *Public Culture* 14(1): 1-19.
- Gilly, Adolfo (2002) *The Last Glow of the Mexican Revolution*. In *The Zapatista Reader*, edited by Tom Hayden. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press. Originally published in *Rural Revolt in Mexico* 1998.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri (2000) *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Harvey, Neil (1998) *The Chiapas Rebellion: The Struggle for Land and Democracy*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hellman, Judith A. (2000) *Real and Virtual Chiapas: Magic Realism and the Left. Necessary and Unnecessary Utopias*. *Socialist Register* 2000: 161-186.
- Hernandez Navarro, Luis (2002) *Mexico's Secret War*. In *The Zapatista Reader*, edited by Tom Hayden. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press. Originally published in *NACLA Report on the Americas* May/June 1999.
- Kingsnorth, Paul (2003) *One No, Many Yeses: A Journey to the Heart of the Global Resistance Movement*. London: The Free Press.
- Klein, Naomi (2002) *Fences and Windows: Dispatches From the Front Lines of the Globalization Debate*. Toronto: Vintage Canada.
- Lee, Benjamin and Edward LiPuma (2002) *Cultures of Circulation: The Imaginations of Modernity*. *Public Culture* 14(1): 191-213.
- Leyva Solano, Xochitl (1998) *The New Zapatista Movement: Political Levels, Actors, and Political Discourse in Contemporary Mexico*. Chap. 3 in *Encuentros Antropologicos: Politics, Identity and Mobility in Mexican Society*, edited by Valentina Napolitano and Xochitl Leyva Solano. London: Institute of Latin American Studies.

- Meyer, Jean (2002) Once Again, the Noble Savage. In *The Zapatista Reader*, edited by Tom Hayden. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press. Originally published in *Letras Libras* 1998.
- Monsivais, Carlos (2002) From the Subsoil to the Mask That Reveals: the Visible Indian. In *The Zapatista Reader*, edited by Tom Hayden. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press. Originally published in *Proceso* March 3, 2001.
- Nash, June (2001) *Mayan Visions: The Quest for Autonomy in an Age of Globalization*. New York: Routledge.
- Nevitte, Neil (1996) *The Decline of Deference : Canadian Value Change in Cross-National Perspective*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.
- Oppenheimer, Andres (2002) Guerrillas in the Mist. In *The Zapatista Reader*, edited by Tom Hayden. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press. Originally published in *The New Republic* 1999.
- Ross, John (2000) *The War Against Oblivion: The Zapatista Chronicles*. Monroe: Common Courage Press.
- Rus, Jan, Rosalva Aida Hernandez Castillo, and Shannan L. Mattiace Eds. (2003) *Mayan Lives, Mayan Utopias: The Indigenous Peoples of Chiapas and the Zapatista Rebellion*. Toronto: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Solnit, Rebecca (2004) *Hope in the Dark: Untold Histories, Wild Possibilities*. New York: Nation Books.
- Stavans, Ilan (2002) Unmasking Marcos. In *The Zapatista Reader*, edited by Tom Hayden. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press. Originally published in *Transition* Spring 1996.
- Stephen, Lynn (2002) *Zapata Lives!: Histories and Cultural Politics in Southern Mexico*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Taylor, Charles (2002) *Modern Social Imaginaries*. *Public Culture* 14(1): 91-124.
- Weinberg, Bill *Homage to Chiapas*. New York: Verso.
- Womack, Jr., John (1999) *Rebellion in Chiapas*. New York: The New Press.

Institute on Globalization and the HUMAN CONDITION

The Institute on Globalization and the Human Condition was created in January 1998 following the designation of globalization and the human condition as a strategic area of research by the Senate of McMaster University. Subsequently, it was approved as an official research center by the University Planning Committee. The Institute brings together a group of approximately 30 scholars from both the social sciences and humanities. Its mandate includes the following responsibilities:

- a facilitator of research and interdisciplinary discussion with the view to building an intellectual community focused on globalization issues.*
- a centre for dialogue between the university and the community on globalization issues*
- a promoter and administrator of new graduate programming*

In January 2002, the Institute also became the host for a Major Collaborative Research Initiatives Project funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada where a group of over 40 researchers from across Canada and abroad are examining the relationships between globalization and autonomy.

<http://globalization.mcmaster.ca/>

The WORKING PAPER SERIES...

circulates papers by members of the Institute as well as other faculty members and invited graduate students at McMaster University working on the theme of globalization. Scholars invited by the Institute to present lectures at McMaster will also be invited to contribute to the series.

Objectives:

To foster dialogue and awareness of research among scholars at McMaster and elsewhere whose work focuses upon globalization, its impact on economic, social, political and cultural relations, and the response of individuals, groups and societies to these impacts. Given the complexity of the globalization phenomenon and the diverse reactions to it, it is helpful to focus upon these issues from a variety of disciplinary perspectives.

To assist scholars at McMaster and elsewhere to clarify and refine their research on globalization in preparation for eventual publication.

“Globalizaing Hope: The Resonance of Zapatismo and the Political Imagination(s) of Transnational Activism”

Alex Khasnabish, PhD Candidate

khasnaa@mcmaster.ca

Department of Anthropology

McMaster University

1280 Main St West

Hamilton, ON L8S 4M4